



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/065,787	04/23/1998	RODNEY GLEN ADAMS	17275-P043US	7960	
21909	590 01/14/2003				
CARR LAW FIRM, L.L.P.			EXAMINER		
670 FOUNDE 900 JACKSON	STREET		LOGSDON, JOSEPH B		
DALLAS, TX	75202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2662		
			DATE MAIL ED: 01/14/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Di.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/065,787	ADAMS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joe Logsdon	2662
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 09 December 2002 FAILS TO PLAGE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ivoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date or		
b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. $\square$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:	
(a)   they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);
(b) $\square$ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	or reconsideration has been con- tion to the continuation Sheet.	sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-42</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper Na(s).	1/.
10. Other:	M	6
	HASSAN MI	700
	SUPERVISORY PATEN	•
C Detect and Trademody Office	TECHNOLOGY CEN	TEP 2600





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the modification of Brown using Hyde-Thomson would not have been obvious because the modification would have certain disadvantages. But whether disadvantages exist is irrelevant to a 103(a) rejection (assuming, of course, that they do not involve either inoperability or a significant change in principle of operation); what matters is whether the modification would have been obvious because of the resulting advantages.

The amendment to claim 13 will be entered because it obviates the 112, second paragraph rejection.